DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 787 EC 124 511

AUTHOR Shipley, Edward G.
TITLE Screening for Gifted Children: The Use of Training and Observation in the Identification Process.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 96p.: Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Sarasota.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ability Identification: Elementary Education: Exceptional Child Research: *Gifted: Observation: Peer Relationship: *Program Effectiveness: *Screening Tests: *Talent Identification

ABSTRACT

A screening model to identify gifted elementary students (grades 3 through 5) was evaluated to reduce the inefficient use of the school psychologist's time. The screening devices used to select children for the final criterion measure were (1) training, observation, and nomination by teachers: (2) orientation and the use of a sociometric technique to obtain peer nominations; and (3) screening of the school records to determine a list of students making an IQ score of 120 or higher on a group ability test. A total of 43 out of 47 children qualified by meeting all of the screening criteria for an efficiency rate of 91%. Only one student qualified by a group test score without being nominated resulting in an effectiveness rate of 98%. The screening model was found to be more efficient than traditional methods to determine early entrance candidates. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189787

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCREENING FOR GIFTED CHILDREN: THE USE OF TRAINING AND OBSERVATION IN THE IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of The University of Sarasota

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Edward G. Shipley

August, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward G. Shipley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC124511

ABSTRACT

SCREENING FOR GIFTED CHILDREN: THE USE OF TRAINING AND OBSERVATION IN THE IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

The goal of this investigation was to develop, field test, and evaluate a new, efficient, and effective screening procedure to identify gifted children in grades three, four, and five in a rural area of Ohio. The author's research was pursued because the traditional method (i.e. teacher referral followed by individual psychological evaluation) has been inefficient with respect to the use of the school psychologist's time. Gifted programs are being expanded in Ohio although school psychological services personnel remain constant as programs for exceptional children increase annually.

The results obtained by trained screeners in the literature showed an average efficiency rate of 37%. The present early school entrance program for gifted children in the local school district has averaged 35% in efficiency over the past seven years. The new screening procedure devised by the researcher was an attempt to improve on this low efficiency rate and, thus, reduce the inefficient use of the school psychologist's time.

The screening devices used to select children for the final criterion measure were: (1) training, observation, and nominations by teachers, (2) orientation and the use of a sociometric technique to obtain peer nominations, and (3) screening of the school records to determine a list of students making an I. Q. score of 120 or

higher on a group ability test (Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test). All students meeting the group screening criteria, regardless of nomination status, were evaluated by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised. A total of 43 out of 47 children qualified by meeting all of the screening criteria for an efficiency rate of 91%. Only one student qualified by a group test score without being nominated resulting in an effectiveness rate of 98%.

A comparison of the results of the author's screening procedure with those cited in the literature by trained screeners (historical controls) shows an increase in the average efficiency rate from 37% to 84% for teachers and an increase in the average efficiency rate from 72% to 88% for parents. The author's screening procedure resulted in an average peer efficiency rate of 78% which compares favorably with the other nominating groups. The writer could not locate any pertinent results in the literature for a historical control comparison.

The researcher's screening procedure based on training and observation to identify potentially gifted children is a much more efficient method (i.e. identified gifted children with a higher rate of incidence; and conserves the school psychologist's time by decreasing the amount of time spent in administering individual evaluations) than the methods cited in the literature and used in the local school district to determine early entrance candidates.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Introduction	1
	Need for the Study	2
	Purpose of the Study	4
	Statement of the Problem	5
	Subproblems	5
	Delimitations	6
	Limitations	6
	Definitions	7
	Summary	8
II.	A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
	Summary	19
III.	METHODOLOGY	21
	Description of the Subproblems	21
	Description of the Subjects	21
	Description of the Instrumentation	22
	Description of the Procedures	27
	Treatment of the Data	29
	Summary	30
IV.	FINDINGS	31
	Introduction	31
	Evaluation of Training Models and Evaluation Forms	31
	Evaluation of Results and Comparison with Historical Controls	33
	Identification of Significant Factors in the Screening Instruments	37
	Summary	42
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	43
	Summary	43
	Conclusions	47
	Recommendations	49
	Summary	50
Bibliography		51
Appendixes		
	Appendix A - Expert Evaluation of Instruments	54
	Appendix B - Instrumentation for Teachers	61
	Appendix C - Instrumentation for Peers	71
	Appendix D - Instrumentation for Parents	75
	Appendix E - Teacher and Parent Evaluation Forms	81
	Appendix F - Summary of Pupil Data	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Results of Observational Screening Procedure	34
2.	Comparison Between Screening Procedure and Historical Controls	36
3.	Results of Teacher Nominations	38
4.	Results of Peer Nominations	39
5.	Results of Parent Nominations	41

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The identification of gifted children is not an easy task and should not be done by an untrained observer. In many schools the untrained observer is usually the classroom teacher who does not have an impressive record regarding the recognition of characteristics common to children with high academic ability. Several studies suggest that teachers who are not trained to recognize gifted characteristics will tend to omit large numbers of children who are actually gifted and nominate others who are not gifted.

Programs for exceptional children have been expanding rapidly during the past few years with educational opportunities for the gifted being planned for implementation within the next year or two at the local level in Ohio. Traditionally, candidates for special programs are referred by the teacher and this is followed by an individual evaluation by the school psychologist. Thus, many children are evaluated who do not qualify resulting in the inefficient use of staff time.

The investigator developed a screening model which included a thorough training of teachers and other nominators in the proper use of observation as a technique to analyze and identify superior intellectual ability in children. After the training, all referred children were processed through the screening procedure culminating in an individual evaluation and placement committee review.

Need for the Study

In a school district which is very large geographically and sparsely populated, the school psychologist must make efficient use of his time due to the number of children and school buildings to be served. The task of the school psychologist to provide adequate services to existing and new special programs in recent years without additional staff has become increasingly difficult. The ratio of school psychologists to children served (1:3000) has not changed in Ohio during the past four years while special programs have accelerated at a rapid pace. To compound the problem, assessment is now required by law which includes the input of information from various sources about a child's functioning and is commonly referred to as multi-factored evaluation. This expanded type of evaluation tends to decrease the number of children who can receive psychological services during the school year.

The only area of exceptional children not being served to any degree at the present time is in the realm of gifted education. According to a recent publication distributed by the Ohio Department of Education (School Slate, 1977), the level of state funding to promote gifted education programs in Ohio has increased from zero in 1974 to $300,000 annually in 1977. Legislation is now pending in the Ohio legislature to make gifted education mandatory with state funding. At the present time there is a network of seventeen gifted education coordinators in the state located mostly in the urban areas. Eventually the entire state will be receiving gifted educational services just as the other areas of exceptionality are now served.

Preliminary planning is now in progress at the local level to expand the present limited services for gifted children into a broader program. Additional services would include assistance to gifted students and their parents at all grade levels. The Ohio Valley School District receives considerable funds from the federal government for special programs annually and some of these funds may be allocated for gifted programming.

The only formal program for gifted children in the local school district at the present time is the evaluation of children whose date of birth falls within the three month period following the state cutoff date for school entrance on September 30. This program has been in effect since 1971 and involves referral by the parents and preliminary screening by the principal. The files pertaining to early entrance evaluations were checked and reflected an average efficiency rate of approximately 35% over the past seven years.

The implementation of expanded gifted programming in the local school district within one to two years would create an excessive demand for psychological services which could not be met without additional staff and/or an effective and efficient screening procedure. The teachers need training in the use of observational techniques to properly identify a high percentage of children who would be potential candidates to meet state standards for admission to the program. At the present time the Ohio Department of Education does not expect any change in school psychology ratios for two to three years.

A review of the literature on this topic revealed that various researchers have studied different aspects of identification of giftedness by observational methods with conflicting results. The author could not locate any studies which utilized a comprehensive observational model preceded by training of the nominators (teachers, peers, and parents). In the author's research, final placement in a gifted program was determined by nomination, a review of existing standardized group ability test data, an individual evaluation, and a review by the placement committee.

Traditionally, the school psychologist has been given most of the responsibility for identifying children for special programs. Multi-factored assessment requires the input of other school personnel. The use of the skills of other staff members would result in a better screening procedure and thus allow more time for the school psychologist to provide services to the children now in special programs and perform other required duties.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the investigator's research is the development of a screening model to locate gifted children at the elementary school level utilizing a comprehensive observational method in the identification process.

The screening model was developed through an analysis and selection of available instrumentation, training of nominators followed by observation of students and nominations, a review of the school records to determine which students ranked in the top 10% on group ability tests, individual assessment of selected students,

and an analysis of the screening procedure to determine its usefulness in regard to efficiency and effectiveness.

Statement of the Problem

This is a study pertaining to the use of training and observation in a screening model in order tc determine if a high degree of efficiency and effectiveness can be achieved in the identification of gifted children at the elementary school level.

Subproblems

In order to solve the problem of developing an efficient and effective screening model using a comprehensive observational technique, the author needed to solve the following subproblems:

(1) To develop an observational training model for teachers and parents that was useful in identifying potential candidates for a gifted program.

(2) To evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the observational screening model by (1) the administration of an individual intelligence test to all nominated children who met the selection criteria and other children not nominated but scoring within the top 10% on a group test of general ability and (2) a comparison of the results obtained in the field testing of the observational training model and procedure with the studies of trained screeners reported in the literature (historical controls).

(3) To identify the characteristics and/or items used in the observational screening procedure that were the most valid

indicators of children who eventually qualified for a gifted program.

Delimitations

The scope of the writer's research was delimited in the ways described below.

First, the research was restricted geographically to three rural counties in southern Ohio (Adams, Brown, and Highland). This is a typical Appalachian area with the unemployment and welfare recipient rate above the national average. Therefore, care should be used in extrapolating the results to other geographical areas.

Second, the writer's work has been delimited to the elementary school level in grades three, four, and five. Hence, the results may not be descriptive of younger or older gifted children.

Limitations

In view of the minimum teacher salary schedules in rural Ohio, the quality of instruction in all classrooms may not be at a high level. Accordingly, the varying skills of teacher participants to observe correctly limited the results to some degree although each nominator (teacher, peer, and parent) received the same type of training prior to making nominations.

Recent legislation pertaining to the education of exceptional children has increased the paperwork for teachers. Thus, some teachers felt that participation in a training program and making nominations for gifted programming resulted in additional work since this type of service is not available during the current school year.

The researcher's study was limited to the 1978-79 school year.

Definitions

(1) Effectiveness: The number of gifted children found in a group by screening divided by the true number of gifted in the same group times 100.

(2) Efficiency: The number of gifted children found in a group by screening divided by the total screened as gifted in the same group times 100.

(3) Gifted Child: A child who is functioning or has the potential to function at a high intellectual level as measured by an individual intelligence test (minimum I. Q. score of 125).

(4) Gifted Program: A program designed to assist the gifted child to pursue his interests, make use of his creative abilities, and promote positive attitudes towards discovery, investigation, and learning in general.

(5) Multi-Factored Assessment: An evaluation of more than one area of a child's functioning so that no single procedure can be the sole criterion for determining an appropriate educational placement.

(6) Nominator: A person who has received training in observational techniques as related to gifted characteristics.

(7) Parent Observation Form: An instrument containing a list of behavioral characteristics used to obtain information from parents of potentially gifted children.

(8) Parent Training Model: An information device used to aid parents prior to completion of the Parent Observation Form.

(9) Peer Observation: A sociometric technique of the "Guess Who" variety used in identifying gifted children who may or may not be located by other techniques.

(10) Teacher Observation Form: An instrument containing a list of behavioral characteristics used to aid teachers in identifying gifted children who may or may not be located by other techniques.

(11) Teacher Training Model: An inservice training device used to train teachers in observational skills prior to nomination of potentially gifted children.

Summary

In this chapter the author has presented a general overview of the research project which resulted in the development, field testing, and evaluation of a screening procedure to identify gifted children at the elementary school level in an efficient and effective manner utilizing training of and observation by teachers, peers, and parents.

CHAPTER II - A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In a review of the literature dealing with the role of teacher judgment in the identification process Gallagher (1966) pointed out some of the major weaknesses of teacher ratings. Due to the low level of effectiveness of teacher judgment, he suggested a cautious approach to accepting teacher nomination as a basis for identification. He concluded by stating that most authorities would agree that teachers' opinions definitely need to be supplemented with more objective rating methods.

During the past twenty years several studies (Pegnato and Birch, 1959; Baldwin, 1962; Cornish, 1968) have been completed on the use of teacher nomination to locate potential gifted students with disappointing results. Each study relied on the teacher to define the concept of giftedness and to nominate pupils accordingly. If teachers were given instruction, the selection of potentially gifted students through nomination would be an effective teacher screening procedure. The use of more structured, objective teacher screening procedures based on specific behavioral characteristics has been supported by Gallagher (1966).

The development of the researcher's comprehensive observational screening model represents an attempt to provide a more objective and systematic tool that can be used as a guide for teacher, peer, and parent judgment in the process of identification. In view of the fact that teachers are with children in a learning situation it would seem that their judgment would be effective and efficient as a means of locating students with high intellectual ability.

In order to locate information pertaining to the researcher's study a thorough search of the literature was completed including the use of ERIC, DATRIX, a personal review of various publications, and written contact with several authorities in the field of gifted education. Most of the important research on this topic has been done over the past twenty years with very few studies completed in recent years. Following is a report on selected studies of significant value pertaining to the nomination of potentially gifted children by teachers, peers, and parents.

The most classic study referred to in the literature is the one completed by Pegnato and Birch (1959) in which they attempted to discover which procedures or which combination of commonly used procedures would prove best in the identification of academically gifted students. The methods considered were teacher judgment, honor roll list, interest in art and music, special abilities, group intelligence and achievement test scores, and a combination of methods. The subjects were junior high school students from a favorable area of Pittsburgh. The results indicated that teachers were the least reliable source of identification as nearly one third of those nominated were not found to be gifted. The teachers nominated approximately 50% of the children who were later identified as gifted. Pegnato and Birch concluded that a combination of group achievement and intelligence tests seemed to be the best combination which located 96% of the gifted students in the study. This classic study has been widely cited in research but it does have some limitations. First, the students scoring below the cutoff point

were not tested so there is no way of knowing how many gifted students were missed. Second, the use of junior high school teachers was questionable since they did not know the students as well as elementary school teachers. The study by Pegnato and Birch points out the need for a structured system of observation prior to making a nomination and training in the use of observational techniques which is included in the author's study. Also, Pegnato and Birch used subjects from a high socio-economic area as compared to the researcher's study where the students could be described as more typical of the middle to lower class. In this regard, giftedness in the author's sample group would more likely be hidden by certain cultural factors.

A study by Kirk (1966) investigated the problem of determining how well kindergarten teachers could select the bright and slow children in their classes when given guidelines for evaluating nine areas of ability and when adjustments were made for chronological age differences. Kindergarten students were used as subjects and were rated by their teachers in nine areas including reasoning, learning, speed, perception, verbal, numerical, creativity, etc. They were not compared to a standard but to the peer group as being slow, average, or rapid. The study showed that teachers are subject to a chronological age bias, selecting older children as bright and younger children as slow. The judgment was made accurate by evaluating several areas to procure a composite score. The procedure was refined even further by adjusting for the chronological age and applying it to the composite score. Kirk concluded that kindergarten teachers

tend to be influenced by the child's chronological age in their nominations because older children exhibit greater maturity. The reasons that teachers in this study had difficulty with their nominations were due to their lack of knowledge regarding the factors that make up intelligence and they did not take into account the effect of the chronological age which could vary as much as two years at the kindergarten level. Kirk's study had implications for the present study in that the author included the factor of chronological age bias in the training model in order to obtain a more accurate nomination.

Doughty (1971) attempted to determine what information gathering devices other than intelligence tests would serve to identify gifted children efficiently. The subjects used were students in a public and private setting in the midwest at the intermediate level. The results showed that gifted students were most easily identified by a standardized test of academic achievement, a test of personality, and a self-concept inventory. He then concluded that teacher identification without the use of intelligence tests must use a combination of other information gathering devices in order to be effective and efficient. Students who rated themselves highly in personality and self-concept were correspondingly higher in intelligence. Creativity tests play a minor role in the identification procedure. Doughty recommends that the score of 120 I. Q. be used as a minimum for gifted children. Further, he states that a combination of techniques should be used which concurs with recent trends in gifted identification. Doughty does not include an

intelligence test as one of his three screening devices although most researcher's report that it has been used effectively for screening. The present study differs somewhat from Doughty's work in that the author did not use self-reporting techniques but trained observers to obtain part of the data.

A study by Renzulli, Hartman, and Callahan (1971) developed a behavioral rating scale that was objective and systematic to be used by teachers as an aid in the identification process. They made a comprehensive review of the literature dealing with gifted traits and selected the most common items for the scale. The scale included traits pertaining to learning, motivation, creativity, and leadership. It was tested in a series of studies. Validation studies showed a favorable correlation with group tests especially in the area of learning and motivation. They concluded that behavioral ratings should be secured from as many sources as possible. This is an unusually thoughtful scale and should be used as part of a comprehensive screening procedure. In view of the research that has been done by these researchers, the author used a modified form of this instrument in the present study. This work greatly aided the development of the author's procedure. The procedure developed by the writer was expanded to include a scale for parent and peer nominations preceded by training of the nominators.

In another study by Doughty (1969), he investigated some of the characteristic differences between children identified as gifted and non-gifted. The subjects were intermediate grade students from a public and private school. Ten measuring devices were

administered including standardized instruments and self-reporting tools. The I. Q. score of 120 was used as the minimum for determing giftedness. Use of the checklist resulted in a 64% teacher efficiency rate. He then concluded that students in the intermediate grades can do a more significant job of differentiating between gifted and non-gifted students than their teachers. In view of the fact that several gifted children in Doughty's study were not nominated, special care must be given to identifying these students. In comparing Doughty's work with the present study, it should be noted that parent nominations were not considered. Also, training prior to nomination was not given to any of the participants. Doughty included measures of personality, anxiety, activities, and self-concept reports which were not used in the present study.

A study to investigate the use of peer group choice as a screening technique was done by Granzin and Granzin (1969). In their study they used a sociometric technique which was a 30 item instrument of the "Guess Who" variety. The instrument was given to fourth graders in a high socio-economic area of Urbana, Illinois. The instrument contained 15 items of gifted traits and was administered twice - once with the 30 items and then with the 15 gifted items the second time. The authors used 120 I. Q. as the cutoff score for giftedness. The results showed that fourth grade students were able to identify gifted characteristics in their peer group with an average efficiency rate of 51%. Rankings by all peers were generally more significant than rankings by gifted peers only. Peer group identification efficiency agreed closely

with those of the teachers. Granzin and Granzin recommended that peer group choice be used as an additional method of screening for giftedness. This was a fairly well designed study but the sample was small and the subjects were not highly representative of fourth graders across the nation. The present study utilized peer nomination but was preceded by a more thorough explanation as to the kind of responses desired. Further, the subjects in the present study were more typical of the middle class environmental background than the study by Granzin and Granzin.

In Jacob's (1971) study, he attempted to determine whether or not parents could be used effectively in identifying young gifted students. The Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence was given to kindergarten children in the Plymouth, Michigan Schools followed by nomination of gifted children by teachers and parents with no definition or criterion of giftedness offered. He found that the teachers nominated around 10% of the gifted children with parents being far more accurate by nominating 76% who were later identified as gifted. Jacobs concluded that parents are able to identify their own children as gifted better than teachers. The commonly held belief that parents tend to overestimate their child's ability was not supported by this study. The effectiveness of teacher nomination tends to decrease from the secondary level to the kindergarten level (50% to 10%). It appears that parent opinion of a child's high intellectual ability is a potentially useful source of worthwhile information that has not been utilized by professionals in the past. The use of parent

nomination was used in the present study as an integral part of the comprehensive procedure with adequate training prior to nomination.

Ciha, Harris, and Hoffman (1974) studied the possibility of using parents of kindergarten children as a gross screening device to identify the very young gifted child at the beginning of his school career. In this study they used 15% of the kindergarten students in Rockford, Illinois. The subjects were given the Slosson Intelligence Test and two subtests of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. Parents and teachers nominated children whom they thought were gifted. The efficiency rate of parent nomination was 67% while the teacher's efficiency rate was 22%. Parents from minority areas tended to have the best nomination rate. Although parents did tend to overestimate their children's abilities they did better than either teacher or standardized test results. Parental opinion of a child's academic potential is a source of useful information at the kindergarten level and more efficient than teacher nomination. In the study by Ciha, Harris, and Hoffman the teachers were not given any criteria on which to base their judgment. The author's study is different in that giftedness was defined clearly. The younger the child the more difficult it becomes to distinguish gifted characteristics. Since it is harder to obtain a significant rate of identification at the kindergarten level by teachers, the author used slightly older children as subjects.

In a more recent study by Malone and Moonan (1975), they devised a method for predicting a "state of giftedness" from

knowledge of "states" of other behavioral information and selected those items of behavioral data most useful in the prediction process. A Behavioral Identification of Giftedness (BIG) questionnaire was administered to elementary school children in a multi-racial section of San Diego, California. States of giftedness were defined on the basis of intelligence. Many of the items were drawn from the work of Renzulli. The results showed that a 50 item instrument was very useful in distinguishing behavior of gifted children from non-gifted children when used in the most optimum sequential combination of items and response levels. On the basis of Malone and Moonan's research, parents were found to be a quite reliable source of identification of giftedness. More research on their work is planned to result in a shortened questionnaire. Parent information can be useful in identification but other methods are also needed. Parental estimates should be considered but are not reliable enough to be the sole criteria of identification. The present study included some of the behavioral descriptors researched by Renzulli and Malone-Moonan but differs in the type of subjects used. The subjects in the present study were primarily mono-racial in a rural area as opposed to multi-racial participants in an urban area.

The most recent study pertaining to the author's study was done by Renzulli and Smith (1977) in which they compared two general approaches (traditional and case study method) to judge teacher effectiveness and efficiency including cost and time factors of the two approaches. The subjects were elementary students with the traditional group being given a group ability test followed by an

individual intelligence test. The case study group approach included the collecting of data regarding test scores, teacher ratings, review of school records, parent ratings, and self-ratings. All information was reviewed by a committee. Cost and time factors were analyzed along with the examination of the usefulness of the information collected in the case study. The results reflected that the case study approach was generally superior to the traditional approach because of its consideration of multiple sources of information. It was found to be less time consuming, less costly, and more effective. The authors concluded that the identification process should be based on a variety of information that reflects several indicators of a child's superior performance or potential for superior performance in a program that is designed to enhance academic ability. Although the case study approach is less costly, in terms of time and money, it is clear that certain features of both approaches are optimally desirable in a comprehensive identification system. As gifted programs are expanded it will be necessary to have a flexible identification procedure to serve a variety of backgrounds. The present study has several similarities to the work of Renzulli and Smith but self-ratings were not included as part of the process. In their study, training did not precede the nomination of potential gifted children.

In view of the results obtained in the preceding studies other authors were consulted. Goldberg (1956) cites research that found teachers could accurately identify gifted students to a high degree in a sample of elementary school students. Gold (1965) recommends

the use of teacher judgment when the teachers are given a list of characteristics of the gifted in order to improve the accuracy of their nominations. Teacher nomination is one of the most widely used practices to identify gifted children especially in rural areas as mentioned by Gallagher (1975). He recommends that teachers be given a checklist or inservice training in order to help them correctly identify as many gifted students as possible. The results of studies of teacher effectiveness in identifying gifted students varies and thus the use of their judgment should be used with caution as advised by Stanley (1976).

Summary

A review of the pertinent literature pertaining to gifted children identification by means of observation shows conflicting results. Most researchers agree that teachers and other nominators need training in the nature and needs of gifted children in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of screening programs. It would seem vital that persons who are requested to nominate potential candidates for gifted programs be given some type of guidelines. Teacher inservice training regarding the gifted child is not common in many school districts.

It would seem wise to consider teacher ratings in conjunction with other means of identification. Peer and parent nominations with appropriate training should certainly be considered as an important part of the total identification process.

In Chapter 3 the author will present the methods and procedures of the study. For the purposes of presentation the next chapter has

been divided into five sections, namely, description of the sub-problems, description of the subjects, description of the research instrumentation, description of the procedures, and the treatment of the data.

CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY

Description of the Subproblems

Listed below are the subproblems that the investigator pursued in the research project.

Subproblem 1: Can we develop an observational training model for teachers and parents that is useful and helpful in identifying potential candidates for a gifted program?

Subproblem 2: Can we evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of an observational screening procedure to determine if (1) a high degree of nominated children will be identified as eligible for a gifted program and (2) this new method is superior to the studies completed by trained screeners in the literature (historical controls)?

Subproblem 3: Can we identify those factors and/or items used in the observational screening procedure that are most indicative of gifted children?

Description of the Subjects

The population for the investigator's research consisted of all third, fourth, and fifth grade classes in the Ohio Valley School District during the 1977-78 school year. The district has fifteen elementary schools with seventeen third grade classes, eighteen fourth grade classes, and sixteen fifth grade classes.

The Ohio Valley School District is the largest school district in geographical area in the state of Ohio. It is located in southern Ohio along the Ohio River and is approximately sixty five miles east of Cincinnati. The district is primarily rural in nature with a population around 20,000 people. Most residents could be described as middle to lower class with less than 1% being members of minority groups.

The total sample size was equal to approximately 59% of the total number of classes in the population (i.e., 30/51). Before the sample was taken the classes were stratified on the basis of grade level (i.e. third, fourth, and fifth grade) in order to insure that the sample was representative of the total population at the selected grade levels. The sample classes were drawn in the following manner: (1) the names of all third grade teachers were written on small cards, placed in a container, and ten names were selected; (2) the names of all fourth grade teachers were written on small cards, placed in a container, and ten names were selected; and (3) the names of all fifth grade teachers were written on small cards, placed in a container, and ten names were selected.

Description of the Research Instrumentation

(1) Training Model for Teachers (see Appendix B)

Most authorities in the literature agree that the ability of teachers to identify gifted children would be greatly improved by training in the use of observational skills. In developing this model, the author consulted several authorities including Anastasi (1971), DeHaan and Kough

(1956), Boehm and Weinberg (1977), Cruickshank and Johnson (1967), and Gallagher (1970). The contents of this model was based primarily on their work. It contains a multi-dimensional definition of giftedness, basic procedures in the observation of behavior, observable characteristics of gifted children, limitations in identifying giftedness, and general information regarding the myths and facts of giftedness. Teachers participating in the researcher's study received one hour of training conducted by the writer. This model was used as a basic reference and guide for the training session. These teachers evaluated the model after using it (see Appendix E).

(2) Teacher Observation Form (see Appendix B)

In the development of this instrument the researcher contacted the department of education in several states, the U. S. Office of Education, several school systems, service agencies, and authorities in the field of gifted education. After an exhaustive review of the material and instruments, the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students developed by Renzulli (1976) were selected as the basis for the instrument. Renzulli conducted extensive research on the characteristics of giftedness and devised scales containing the most common ones into scales in ten areas. Following publication of the scales, follow-up studies were conducted which showed that the most important sections of learning, motivation, and creativity correlated fairly well with

standardized tests of intelligence and achievement. The writer selected the most significant characteristics in each area which were combined into a short summary and used as a guide in making nominations based on structured observation. The last item on the form requested that the teacher indicate the top 10% of his/her students in priority rank. This tool assisted teachers to be more objective in their identification of gifted children - a need that was recognized by Gallagher (1966) when he stated that most authorities would agree that teachers' opinions definitely need supplementing with more objective rating methods. Participating teachers evaluated this instrument after using it (see Appendix E).

(3) Peer Orientation and Nomination Form (see Appendix C)
This is a "Guess Who" technique, a sociometric instrument, in which the author presented sketches of various behaviors and then asked the class members to list the name of the classmate who best fit the description. Descriptions were given in five areas - academic aptitude, creativity, leadership, performing arts, and artistic ability. According to Anastasi (1971), sociometric nominations have generally proved to be one of the most dependable of rating techniques and have good validity and reliability. Sociometry provides a large number of raters and favorable positions to observe typical behavior.

(4) Training Model for Parents (see Appendix D)

This training model is quite similar to the one used by teachers and contains the same information, only shorter in content. The information covered in this instrument includes a definition of giftedness, observable characteristics of gifted children, and myths and facts regarding gifted children. Parents of children who met all of the screening criteria participated in a training session of one hour in duration. It was conducted by the researcher. Parents evaluated this model after using it (see Appendix E).

(5) Parent Observation Form (see Appendix D)

The investigator reviewed various parent nomination forms and selected one that was recommended for use by the Area Service Centers for Gifted Education in the state of Illinois. The items in this form were modified slightly in order to present a more concise format. After training, the selected parents were asked to observe their child and rate the behavior on a five point scale in the areas of general intelligence, creativity, and leadership. The second part of the form requested that talent and skill information be indicated in non-school activities. The parent was asked to make a recommendation (nomination) for gifted programming for their child and then grant permission for the final phase of individual evaluation. This form was evaluated by participating parents (see Appendix E).

Note: In order to secure knowledgeable opinions about the usefulness of the preceding five instruments, the investigator sent a copy of the tools to a group of experts for evaluation. Selection of the experts was based on the following criteria: (1) minimum of master's degree in psychology or education and (2) minimum of three years of experience in school psychology or a closely related field (see Appendix A).

(6) Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test

The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test is a series of tests of "abstract intelligence" (i.e. ability to work with ideas and relationships among ideas). The test provides a verbal and non-verbal battery. Reviews of this test in Buros (1972) state that the test meets generally accepted standards accepted for test construction and standardization procedures. Both the verbal and non-verbal batteries provide relatively high correlations with tests of achievement (60's to 80's). Lorge-Thorndike scores also correlate moderately to fairly high with other scores derived from intelligence tests. Scores derived from this test were used as the group I. Q. score in the author's research.

(7) Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised

Although the WISC-R was published after the last edition of the Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook, the following information regarding the WISC is presented below. According to reviewers in Buros (1972) the WISC is a stable,

general purpose, individual intelligence test and is useful and valid as a measure of immediate or present mental functioning. It is currently the best available compendium of individually administered, subject comparison techniques purporting to measure intelligence.

Description of Procedures

The initial planning for the author's research took place during the fall of 1977. In this period of time the researcher contacted several persons and agencies in the field of gifted education including authorities, gifted coordinators at the state level, school systems with well established gifted programs, the U. S. Office of Education, professional associations, and other related agencies. All of the material received was carefully reviewed resulting in the formation of the five part screening procedure that was used in the investigator's research.

After a careful review of the screening instruments and training models by a group of experts in January and February, 1978, the steps listed below were followed in March and April, 1978.

(1) Minor revisions in the instruments were made based upon the recommendations and suggestions of the group of experts.

(2) The random sample was devised and completed so that ten classes each in grades three, four, and five were selected to participate.

(3) Selected teachers participated in a training session of one hour in duration pertaining to the use of observation in identifying gifted children. Teachers received a copy

of the training model and observation form. Training was given by the author.

(4) The teachers observed their classes for a minimum period of five school days and recorded their observations on the teacher observation form.

(5) The investigator completed orientation sessions and peer nominations in all selected classrooms.

(6) At this point the researcher checked the cumulative records of selected classes to ascertain a list of students who had an I. Q. score of 120 or higher on a group ability test (Lorge-Thorndike).

(7) Next, all students who met the screening criteria of being nominated by their teacher or peers and achieving an I. Q. score of 120 or higher on a group test was eligible for the next phase of screening.

(8) The parents of all selected students were contacted by the author to arrange a training session at each participating school. The training session lasted one hour under the direction of the researcher. Parents were given the training model and parent observation form to complete and return.

(9) Participating parents observed for a minimum period of five days and completed the observation form. The forms were then returned to the researcher.

(10) All selected students were given an individual intelligence test (WISC-R) by the investigator or other certified school

psychologist. The students who attained a full scale score of 125 or higher were determined to be eligible for gifted program placement consideration.

(11) A committee composed of the teacher, parent, principal, special education supervisor, and school psychologist met and reviewed all the cases of the students who met the screening criteria and made the final decision for program participation.

The only requirement specified by school policy in the Ohio Valley School District was the acquiring of written permission for the completion of an individual evaluation (see Appendix D). No other stipulations were placed on the research by the school district.

Treatment of the Data

Primary emphasis in the investigator's research was placed on the value of training in observation skills and gifted characteristics as a device to increase the ability of nominators to predict giftedness with a high efficiency rate.

In order to determine the usefulness of the observational training model for teachers and parents, the researcher will present a summary of the evaluations completed by the participants.

To determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the observational training model the investigator administered an individual intelligence test (WISC-R) to all nominated children who met the screening criteria to determine the percentage of qualifying candidates and then compared the results with similar studies completed by trained screeners described in the literature

(historical controls).

To ascertain which factors and/or items in the observational training model that were most indicative of giftedness, the author will present a summary of each instrument used in the procedure.

Summary

In this chapter the writer has presented a detailed description of the methodology used in the research project. The areas covered in the chapter include the three subproblems pursued, description of subjects used in the research, description of the training model and instruments used, description of the procedures in chronological order, and treatment of the data.

CHAPTER IV - FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter of the dissertation will deal with the presentation of the results. It has been divided into three sections which correspond to the three subproblems pursued in the investigator's research. The sections include (1) evaluation of the observational screening model as a useful procedure in identifying gifted children as reported by the teachers and parents who participated in the study, (2) evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the observational screening model as a device to identify giftedness at a high degree compared with the studies completed in the past by trained screeners described in the literature (historical controls), and (3) identification of the factors and/or items in the screening tools that were most indicative and valid as predictors of children who qualified for a gifted program.

Evaluation of Training Models and Observation Forms

Teacher Training Model and Observation Form

All thirty teachers who participated in the author's research completed an evaluation form pertaining to the usefulness of the training model and observation form. A total of 97% of the participants reported that the training model and observation form were basically sound instruments to accomplish the task of screening potential children for gifted programming. Over 30% of the teachers

were quite positive in their comments with several reporting that it was a learning experience regarding the nature and needs of high ability students. A few third grade teachers reported that some parts of the observation form were not appropriate at that grade level especially those pertaining to art, music, and the performing arts. Two teachers felt that the suggested observation period was too short and didn't allow enough time to do an adequate job in completing the form. Only one teacher felt that the procedure was too time consuming.

Parent Training Model and Observation Form

All parents who participated in the writer's research completed the evaluation form regarding the usefulness of the training model and observation form. In general, 96% of the parents rated the training model as adequate while 89% were so inclined in regard to the observation form. The major concern of the parents in completing the observation form pertained to the general nature of the rating items. A total of 21% of the parents felt that the rating items should have been a little more specific. However, it should be noted that 9% of the parents felt that the procedure was quite good and were complimentary in their remarks. Only three parents felt that it was difficult to be objective in rating their own children while two parents thought that the training model should have included more information.

In summary, it can be stated that the evaluation of the training models and observation forms completed by the participants showed that all instruments were basically sound and adequate to accomplish the task of identifying potentially gifted children.

Evaluation of Results and Comparison with Historical Controls

Evaluation of Screening Results

The thirty classroom units used in the researcher's study included a total of 847 pupils. Nominations by teachers and pupils resulted in a total of 82 nominations. The cumulative record of the students in each participating classroom was checked to determine if the nominee ranked within the top 10% on a standardized group test of general ability (Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test). This survey produced two additional nominees who were not nominated but qualified on the basis of a group test score of 120 I. Q. or higher. However, 35 of the students nominated by teachers and peers did not qualify by group test scores resulting in a total of 47 students who qualified for an individual intelligence test to determine their eligibility for a gifted program.

In referring to Table 1, the results of the individual testing showed that 43 of the 47 students qualified (placement consideration) for a gifted program by attaining an individual I. Q. score of 125 or higher on the WISC-R. The nomination efficiency rate in the three grades ranged from a low of 88% to a high of 94% for an average nomination efficiency rate of

Table 1

RESULTS OF OBSERVATIONAL SCREENING PROCEDURE

Grade Levels Used in Research	Gr. 3	Gr. 4	Gr. 5	Total/ Average
Pupils evaluated individually	13	17	17	Total 47
Pupils qualified for program	12	15	17	Total 43
Pupils qualifed	12/13 92%	15/17 88%	16/17 94%	43/47 91%
Teacher nomination efficiency rate	10/13 77%	15/17 88%	15/17 88%	Average 84%
Peer nomination efficiency rate	9/13 69%	12/17 71%	16/17 94%	Average 78%
Parent nomination efficiency rate	10/13 77%	16/17 94%	16/17 94%	Average 88%
Nomination efficiency rate (three groups)	Average 74%	Average 84%	Average 92%	Average 83%

91%. The parents showed the best nomination efficiency rate with an average of 88% while the peers showed the lowest of the three nominating groups with an average of 78%. The overall average for the three nominating groups (teachers, peers, and parents) was 83%. In looking at the grade level nomination efficiency rate, it tended to increase as the grade level increased with grade three nominators showing the lowest average of 74% and the fifth grade nominators showing the highest average of 92%.

Comparison of Screening Model with Historical Controls

In order to determine the efficiency of the author's method of screening for giftedness based on training and observation, a review of the literature was made which cited five pertinent studies by trained screeners, namely, Pegnato and Birch (1959), Doughty (1969), Granzin and Granzin (1969), Jacobs (1971), and Ciha, Harris, and Hoffman (1974).

The teacher nomination efficiency rate in four of the studies average 37% ranging from a low of 10% by Jacobs to a high of 64% by Doughty. Two of these four studies included parent nominations and the efficiency rate for them averaged 72% ranging from a low of 67% by Ciha, Harris, and Hoffman to a high of 76% by Jacobs. The study by Granzin and Granzin showed a peer nomination efficiency rate of 51%. It should be noted that the average nomination efficiency rate for all three nominating groups increased from 53% to 83% when compared with the researcher's method (see Table 2).

Table 2

COMPARISON BETWEEN SCREENING PROCEDURE AND HISTORICAL CONTROLS

Nominating Group	Historical Controls	Observational Screening Procedure
Teacher efficiency rate (4 studies)	Average 37%	84%
Peer efficiency rate (1 study)	Average 51%	78%
Parent efficiency rate (2 studies)	Average 72%	88%
Average efficiency rate	53%	83%

In viewing the field test results of the author's method of screening gifted children as compared to the gifted screening studies completed by trained screeners in the literature, the author concluded that this new method is superior to previous procedures by showing an increase in the nomination efficiency rate for teachers from 37% to 84%, an increase in the nomination efficiency rate for peers from 51% to 78%, and an increase in the nomination efficiency rate for parents from 72% to 88%.

Identification of Significant Factors in the Screening Instruments

Teacher Nominations

In referring to Table 3, the results showed that three factors tended to stand out among children who qualified for a gifted program as reported by the teacher. These three factors were (1) rank within the top 10% of the class in overall characteristics listed on the observation form, (2) rated frequently in learning characteristics, and (3) rated frequently in motivational characteristics. Ratings in artistic characteristics were low with only 16% of the qualified students receiving a rating in this area.

Peer Nominations

In Table 4 the most commonly rated item for identifying giftedness of the five questions presented to the students was the number of total nominations with 81% of the qualifying children receiving ten or more nominations scattered over the five areas. The response to item number one as to the best student in the class resulted in 70% of the qualifying

Table 3

RESULTS OF TEACHER NOMINATIONS

Characteristic	Number of Ratings	Percentage of Rating
Rank in Class (top 10%)	32/43	74%
Learning Characteristics	32/43	74%
Motivation Characteristics	29/43	67%
Communication Characteristics	21/43	49%
Planning Characteristics	19/43	44%
Leadership Characteristics	18/43	42%
Dramatics Characteristics	18/43	42%
Creativity Characteristics	15/43	35%
Musical Characteristics	11/43	26%
Artistic Characteristics	7/43	16%

Table 4

RESULTS OF PEER NOMINATIONS

Categories	Percentage of Nominations	
Total nominations (10 or more) in all five categories	35/43	81%
Learning Ability, Item # 1	30/43	70%
Creative Ability, Item # 2	19/43	44%
Leadership Ability, Item # 3	12/43	28%
Performing Arts Ability, Item # 4	12/43	28%
Artistic Ability, Item # 5	4/43	9%

candidates being listed. Very few children (9%) were identified by a nomination in artistic ability.

Parent Nominations

The results of parent nominations as shown in Table 5 indicate that all 11 questions on the rating form were important but those pertaining to general intelligence received the highest ratings especially items two, three, and one. Parent nomination in the areas of leadership and creativity were of secondary importance.

A total of 91% of the parents of qualifying children reported that their child had some special interest or hobby while 71% reported that their child had received special instruction outside the school program.

Summarizing the significant factors in the three nominating groups, the author has identified those items that were most indicative of gifted children. The results of teacher nominations showed that gifted children received multiple nominations with frequent ratings in learning and motivational characteristics. Peer nomination results reflected that frequent nominations in learning characteristics (Items 2, 3, and 1) determined the students most likely to be identified as gifted. An analysis of the parent nominations resulted in general intelligence items as being the most predictive of high ability followed closely by leadership and creativity items.

Table 5

RESULTS OF PARENT NOMINATIONS

Part I

Categories	Percentage of Nominations	
Item 2 - General Intelligence	191/215 *	89%
Item 3 - General Intelligence	188/215	87%
Item 1 - General Intelligence	181/215	84%
Item 5 - Creativity	173/215	80%
Item 8 - Leadership	172/215	80%
Item 6 - General Intelligence	169/215	79%
Item 9 - Leadership	161/215	75%
Item 10 - Leadership	160/215	74%
Item 4 - General Intelligence	159/215	74%
Item 7 - Creativity	153/215	71%

Part II

General Intelligence - 5 items	5/413 **	83%
Leadership - 3 items	3/229	76%
Creativity - 2 items	2/151	76%

* A total of 215 points would be possible if all qualifying pupils (43) had received a rating of 5 on each item.

** Total percentage points of items in each category.

Summary

In this chapter the writer has presented a fairly detailed summary of the findings in the study as related to the three subproblems pursued.

In the next and final chapter the investigator will present an overall summary of the research project, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER V - SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary focus of the investigator's research was the development, field testing, and evaluation of a screening procedure to identify gifted children with a high rate of efficiency at the elementary school level utilizing the training of and observation by teachers, peers, and parents. The need for the author's study at this time was based on the expansion of programs for gifted children in Ohio with state supported funding and the limited amount of school psychological services available in the Ohio Valley School District. All state funded special programs in Ohio require an individual evaluation by a school psychologist for placement consideration.

The following subproblems were pursued by the author in this research:

(1) The development of an observational training model for teachers and parents that was useful in identifying potential candidates for gifted programs.

(2) The evaluation of the observational screening model by (1) administering an individual intelligence test (WISC-R) to all nominated children who met the screening criteria to determine the efficiency rate, and (2) a comparison of the results with the studies of trained screeners cited in the literature (historical controls).

(3) The identification of the factors in the screening procedure that were most indicative of gifted children.

The subjects used in the writer's research were pupils in grades three, four, and five in the Ohio Valley School District.

A review of the related literature pertaining to the identification of gifted children by means of observation was made and the results were conflicting. Most of the researchers agreed that nominators of gifted children need training in order to be more accurate in their designations of potential candidates who possess high ability. In addition, these trained screeners suggested guidelines and inservice training for teachers and other nominators of the gifted. It was the consensus of opinion among these researchers in the literature that ratings by nominators should always be used in conjunction with other means of identification. In reviewing the literature the author could not locate any screening procedures using training and comprehensive observation to identify giftedness.

The instrumentation used by the researcher to solve the three subproblems consisted of the following tools:

(1) A training model for teachers and observation form.

(2) Peer orientation and nomination form.

(3) A training model for parents and observation form.

After development of the research tools and literature review, the methodology in chronological order was completed as follows: (1) training of teachers followed by observations and nominations,

(2) student orientation and nominations, (3) a review of the school records to determine a list of students ranking in the top 10% and a comparison of this list with the nominated students, (4) training of parents of qualified students followed by observations and nominations, (5) administration of an individual intelligence test by a school psychologist to determine eligibility (I.Q. of 125 or higher), and (6) a review of each case by the placement committee for final recommendation for participation in a gifted program.

In reference to subproblem number one, all teachers and parents completed an evaluation of the training model and observation form. The results of the teacher evaluation showed that 97% considered both parts to be basically sound instruments to accomplish the task of screening potential candidates for gifted programs. The parent evaluation of the training model and observation form resulted in a 96% favorable rating of the training model and an 89% favorable rating of the observation form. On the basis of these results the author concluded that subproblem number one was solved and this phase of the screening procedure was useful to both teachers and parents in identifying gifted characteristics of elementary school age children.

Looking at subproblem number two, the effectiveness rate of the screening procedure was 98% since only one student was located by a group test score that had not been nominated. The results of the field testing resulted in an average efficiency rate for the three grades of 91%. In comparing the efficiency of the researcher's

screening procedure with those cited in the literature by trained screeners (historical controls), the efficiency rate increases from an average of 37% to 84% for teachers, from 51% to 78% for peers, and from 72% to 88% for parents. The results indicate that the investigator's screening procedure is considerably more efficient than those reported in the literature and thus subproblem number two was solved.

Turning to the final subproblem, number three, the author found that multiple nominations in the various skill areas especially in those characteristics pertaining to learning and motivation were the most indicative of gifted children. Accordingly, the researcher concluded that subproblem number three was solved.

Note: The researcher found that of the 82 subjects who were nominated or qualified by group test score, only 43 finally qualified for gifted program placement consideration (i.e. 52%). The researcher felt initially that this was a poor "batting average" for the screening procedure, but, upon re-evaluation, the author decided that this was an acceptable "batting average" since the observational screening procedure was developed to identify a pool of 10% of the students from which the gifted children could be selected - approximately 5% of the "normal" population are considered to be gifted according to Ohio school program standards. Thus, if one were to select the "true" gifted from a pool of the top 10% of the students, one would expect that 50% (41 students) of that pool to qualify. The researcher's finding that 52% finally qualified compares

quite favorably with this theoretical frame of reference.

Conclusions

As a result of the analysis of the data collected relative to the three subproblems pursued in the investigator's research, the conclusions listed below have been made.

(1) The observational screening procedure that was developed and field tested by the writer is a useful and very important aid to teachers and parents in making nominations of potentially gifted children. This conclusion is based on the evaluation of the training models and the observation forms completed by the participants. The nomination efficiency rate was 84% for teachers, 78% for peers, and 88% for parents which is considerably higher than any efficiency rate reported in a review of the literature. The author concluded that the very favorable results derived from the use of this new procedure was due, in part, to the following: (1) careful selection of the best information available as content material for the training models, (2) selection of observable characteristics that are most common to gifted children, and (3) a thorough training of all the participants prior to observation and nominations.

(2) The observational screening procedure developed by the researcher is a very efficient and effective means

of screening gifted children at the third, fourth, and fifth grade levels when compared to the efficiency rate of screening reported in the literature by trained screeners (historical controls). This conclusion is based on the results of the field testing which showed an average efficiency rate of 83% for the three nominating groups as compared to 53% cited in the literature by trained screeners. Only one student was identified as gifted by a group test without nomination resulting in an effectiveness rate of 98% for the screening procedure.

The writer concluded that the high efficiency and effectiveness rate obtained in the field testing was partially due to (1) training of the participants in the techniques of observation especially as applied to gifted characteristics, (2) the use of valid and reliable measuring devices such as the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test and the Wechsler Intelligence Test for Children-Revised, and (3) a sincere desire by most of the nominating participants to do a good job in selecting potential candidates. The author received many favorable comments from the participants in regard to the development of a program to serve the gifted children in the local school district.

(3) The most important factors in identifying gifted children were determined by analyzing all of the

instruments used in the procedure. This conclusion was based on the fact that those children who qualified by individual evaluation were the same children in most cases who received multiple nominations in the various skill areas rated by all three nominating groups. The factors of multiple learning skills, high intellectual ability, and motivation were rated most often by the three nominating groups. The researcher concluded that most children in the gifted category have (1) multiple skills and talents, (2) learn rapidly, and (3) possess many characteristics generally associated with high general intellectual ability.

Recommendations

There were a number of findings in the investigator's research which may have practical implications for others involved in the applied practice and/or research in the area of educational programming for the gifted child.

The investigator's recommendations include the following:

(1) The observational screening procedure used in the author's research should be implemented for use in all elementary schools in the Ohio Valley School District in grades three, four, and five.

(2) The author should provide instructional and other assistance to teachers and parents of identified gifted children until such time as a formal program for this type of student can be implemented. Further,

the researcher should provide leadership in the local school district to develop an appropriate program in accordance with local needs and state standards.

(3) The researcher's screening procedure should be field tested below the third grade and above the fifth grade to determine its efficiency and effectiveness to predict giftedness at those levels.

(4) The investigator's screening procedure should be refined and field tested in further research to determine if any parts can be omitted without any significant loss in the efficiency and/or effectiveness rate.

(5) The author recommends that further research be conducted to improve the observational screening procedure so that gifted children not identified by this method could be included in the final phase of screening.

(6) The screening procedure developed in the author's research should be field tested in non-rural areas to determine its usefulness with other population groups.

Summary

In this chapter the researcher has presented a summary of the investigation relating to screening gifted children by means of an observational approach, conclusions with accompanying implications, and recommendations for practical application of the results and suggestions for further research activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, A. Psychological Testing. (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1971

Cornish, R. L. Parents', teachers', and pupils' perception of the gifted child's ability. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1968, 12 (1), 14-17.

Baldwin, J. W. The relationship between teacher judged giftedness, a group intelligence test, and an individual intelligence test with possible gifted kindergarten pupils. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1962, 6 (4), 153-156.

Boehm, A. E. and Weinberg, R. A. The Classroom Observer: A Guide for Developing Observation Skills. New York: Teachers College Press, 1977.

Buros, O. K. (Ed.). The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Ciha, T. E., Harris, R. and Hoffman, C. Parents as identifiers of giftedness ignored but accurate. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1974, 18 (3), 191-195.

Cruickshank, W. M. and Johnson, G. O. Education of Exceptional Children and Youth. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

DeHaan, R. F. and Kough, J. Identifying Students with Special Needs (Vol. 1). Chicago: Science, Research Associates, 1956.

Doughty, E. Characteristic differences between pupils identified as gifted and non-gifted. Illinois School Research, 1969, 5 (3), 49-54.

_____. Test rankings and selection procedures for identifying gifted intermediate elementary students. Illinois School Research, 1971, 8 (1), 29-32.

Gallagher, J. A. The Gifted Child in the Elementary School. Washington: National Education Association, 1970.

Gallagher, J. J. Research Summary on Gifted Child Education. Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Dept. of Public Instruction, 1966.

_____. Teaching the Gifted Child. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1975.

Gold, M. J. Education of the Intellectually Gifted. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1965.

Goldberg, M. L. Research on the Talented. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.

Granzin, K. L. and Granzin, W. J. Peer group choice as a device for screening intellectually gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1969, 13 (3), 189-194.

Jacobs, J. C. Effectiveness of teacher and parent identification of gifted children as a function of school level. Psychology in the Schools, 1971, 8 (2), 140-142.

Kirk, W. D. A tentative screening procedure for selecting bright and slow children in kindergarten. Exceptional Children, 1966, 33 (4), 13-20.

Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test (Manual). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1964.

Malone, C. E. and Moonan, W. J. Behavioral identification of gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1975, 19 (4), 301-306.

More funds for gifted education. School Slate (Ohio Dept. of Education), September, 1977, p. 2

Pegnato, C. W. and Birch, J. W. Locating gifted children in junior high schools: a comparison of methods. Exceptional Children, 1959, 25 (7), 300-304.

Renzulli, J. S., Hartman, R. K. and Callahan, C. M. Teacher identification of superior students. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38 (3), 211-214.

Renzulli, J. S. and Smith, L. H. Two approaches to identification of gifted students. Exceptional Children, 1977, 43 (8), 512-518.

Renzulli, J. S., Smith, L. H., White, A. J., Callahan, C. M. and Hartman, R. K. Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students. Wethersfield, Connecticut: Creative Learning Press, 1976.

Stanley, J. C. Identifying and nurturing the intellectual gifted. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 58 (3), 234-237.

Thomas, G. I. and Crescimbeni, J. Guiding the Gifted Child. New York: Random House, 1966.

Wechsler, D. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (Manual). New York: Psychological Corporation, 1974.

APPENDIX A

EXPERT EVALUATION OF INSTRUMENTS

754 Delano Ave.
Chillicothe, Ohio 45601
January, 1978

.
.
.

Dear_____:

I am in the process of developing a screening procedure to identify gifted and talented children (grades 3-5) based on a comprehensive observational approach. The screening procedure includes training of teachers and parents and nominations by teachers, peers, and parents. All nominated children and those children not nominated who rank in the top 10% on a standardized group test of ability or achievement will be given an individual intelligence test (WISC-R). All pupils who rank in the top 5% will be eligible for placement consideration in a gifted program.

The contents of the five instruments in my procedure are based on research and a review of several instruments in use throughout the country.

In order to improve the usefulness of this procedure before it is field tested, I would appreciate it very much if you would review the instruments and send me your evaluation.

An early reply would be very helpful since I plan to begin field testing in February. I would be happy to reimburse you for any costs involved. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed.

Thank you for your assistance in this project and I shall look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Edward G. Shipley
Sch. Psychologist

Encl.
(1) Two training models
(2) Three nominating forms
(3) Envelope

February 6, 1978

Mr. Edward G. Shipley
754 Delano Avenue
Chillicothe, Ohio 45601

Dear Mr. Shipley:

My reply to your letter would have been much sooner had surgery not interfered with my plans. I have examined your screening procedures and I like what I see. You have done a tremendous amount of work to produce what I have read. My comments are as follows:

The definition of giftedness that you give in paragraph three on page one is excellent. Your cautions to the participating teachers that you have listed on page two relative to biases are very pertinent. I hope that everyone concerned will read this section carefully.

I noticed that you listed psychomotor or mechanical ability on page one, paragraph two, but that you omitted this category in the teacher observation form.

The peer observation form is excellent. My research and work with children tell me that children know more about themselves and their classroom peers than do most teachers.

The parent observation form will be a welcome addition to any screening procedure. I hope that you can achieve a very high rate of efficiency and effectiveness. They seem to be, sometimes, mutually exclusive.

If I can be of any further help , please let me know.

Sincerely,

Earl Doughty

Dr. Earl Doughty
Professor
Eastern Illinois University
School of Education
Charleston, Illinois 61920

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RECEIVED FROM

George Fichter, Educ. Consultant
Programs for Gifted/Talented
Ohio Dept. of Education
933 High St.
Worthington, Ohio 43085

February 15, 1978

Mr. Fichter made comments on a copy of the research instrumentation and did not write a formal letter in reply. His comments are listed below.

(1) Training Model for Teachers

On page 2, paragraph 2, he felt that the views of others on the staff were especially important in the identification process.

On page 2, item 5, he questioned the inclusion of reviewing observation errors since he felt that teachers should already know this kind of information.

On page 3, paragraph 2, he suggested that the importance of the individual evaluation should be emphasized in capital letters.

On page 4, he suggested that the first paragraph be revised to be more explicit.

On page 4, the last item, he indicated that good thinkers may be identified by creativity measures and this should be emphasized.

(2) Teacher Observation Form

In general, he thought that the form was too detailed and should be shortened if possible.

(3) Peer Orientation and Observation Form

He suggested that the description of characteristics given to students be very clear and detailed in each category.

(4) Parent Training Model

No comments.

(5) Parent Observation Form

No comments.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RECEIVED FROM

Dr. Wilber Simmons, Professor
Dept. of Spec. Education - Gifted Prog.
Kent State University
401 Education Bldg.
Kent, Ohio 44242

February 13, 1978

Dr. Simmons called the researcher and listed below is a summary of his comments regarding the research instrumentatation.

Dr. Simmons reported that the whole procedure was a sound method for screening gifted children and he had no reservations about the researcher proceeding with the field testing in its present form. He did think that these instruments could be used at lower and higher grade levels with satisfactory results.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

February 3, 1978

Edward G. Shipley
754 Delano Avenue
Chillocothe, Ohio 45601

Dear Mr. Shipley,

I read your project with a great deal of interest. I particularly like the idea of a training module with teachers and parents, plus your descriptors are clear and should yield fine results.

The use of a WISC-R for both nominated and those not nominated in the top 10% on group tests will help to minimize teacher bias.

The only suggestion I would make is to consider any child who scores 130 on either a full WISC-R, verbal, or performance as gifted. It will happen and you can miss some highly productive children.

Best wishes on your study.

Cordially,

Dorothy Sisk

Dorothy Sisk
director
Office of Gifted/Talented

TITLE VI E.H.A.

HOPEWELL SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER

133 Willow Street
Hillsboro, Ohio 45133
Phone: 513/393-1904

JOHN A. GOSSETT, *Director*

REGIONAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Guy M. Foster, Chair.
Harry Bennett, V.-Chair.
Jack W. Murphy
Duane Rogers
George Greer
Sister Agatha
Rodger O. Borror
Donald L. Dowdy
Robert Taylor
Richard H. Rannells
Edwin M. Nestor
Carlton J. Binkley
Rita Grippa

February 10, 1978

Mr. Ed Shipley
754 Delano Avenue
Chillicothe, OH 45601

Dear Ed:

I have reviewed your screening procedure to identify gifted and talented children. As I told you the other day on the phone, it looks like a good program. I can see no flaw in the design of the procedures, and if it is well implemented, it should be extremely reliable in identifying the target population. The critical point, it appears to me, will be the instructions to the teachers, parents and children. These instructions will have to be very clear and they will have to be accepted by the observer. The way you have the instructions written in your model does make them clear. The commitment on the part of the observer to follow the instructions can only be obtained through the orientation session.

I would suggest that a paragraph be written for each area in the peer observation form explaining exactly what the areas mean in language the child can understand.

I can give you no constructive feedback on the design because it looks to me that it can't be improved upon. Please let me know how it works out in practice.

Sincerely,

John Williamson, Coordinator
Psychological Services

JW/dcj

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTATION FOR TEACHERS

PART I - TRAINING MODEL FOR TEACHERS

G/T SCREENING PROCEDURE

Introduction

In this training model the teacher or nominator will be provided with instructions that will be helpful in identifying children who possess gifted characteristics through the use of structured observation. This model contains pertinent assistance in the areas of (1) the proper use of observation in identifying behavior characteristics indicating giftedness, and (2) facts and related information regarding the nature of giftedness in children. It is suggested that the users of this model study the material very carefully prior to making nominations.

Definition of Giftedness

The gifted child is one endowed with talent and an innate or potential ability to excel significantly in any given area. Such gifts or talents may be evidenced by general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative thinking, leadership ability, performing arts ability, or any combination of these.

From an operational standpoint we consider the gifted and talented as those children and youth whose abilities, talents, and potential for accomplishment are so outstanding that they require special provisions to meet their educational needs.

Admission to the Gifted Program

In order to qualify for the gifted program, a child must meet all of the criteria in the screening procedure, attain a score in the top 5% as measured by an individual intelligence test, and be recommended by the placement committee.

Basic Procedures in the Observation of Behavior

1. Give each student equal consideration on each behavior characteristic.

   The first procedure is very important. When a teacher is observing for a specific behavior characteristic, care should be exercised so that no child in the classroom is overlooked. Most mistakes in screening are made through oversight. It is important to consider the specific behavior characteristic--NOT THE LABEL--in order to decide if any children fit the description.

2. Observe each child in a variety of situations.

   In order to obtain as complete a picture as possible of each student's behavior, they should be observed in different settings and at different times. Teachers have many opportunities to observe children in a variety of situations--in the classroom; in committee work, recitation, free discussion including conversation between the teacher and student; in the hallways; at lunch time; and at school social events. A child may act one way in one situation but quite differently in another.

Observing children in a variety of situations will help the teacher to become aware of the special talents and abilities some of them possess in various skill areas.

It may be helpful to obtain the views of other teachers and staff members in areas where the classroom teacher's opportunity to observe is limited. These staff members may include the principal, librarian, special teachers in art, music, physical education, etc. Other staff members should evaluate in terms of the identifying characteristics.

3. Compare each child with the rest of the group.

Compare the individual with the group to see if he/she stands out on any particular behavior characteristic.

4. Be aware of biases.

Everyone is biased for or against certain people. This is as natural as liking or disliking certain foods, clothes, or sports. The important thing is to recognize biases and make allowances for them. A teacher with considerable experience said: "I had trouble listing a student's name after a certain characteristic if it did not seem right for me. It finally dawned on me that the only way I could help my students was to be very honest and objective in describing them. When I realized this, I was ready to do my best to identify them so that I could get to the job of helping them."

If a teacher likes a particular child, more good qualities may be seen than he/she actually possesses. On the other hand, the teacher may find it hard to like a child and thus have difficulty in seeing good qualities in him/her. The first step in helping any student is an honest and objective observation. In order to help children they must be identified accurately.

Periodically, staff members who share instructional responsibility for the same child should compare notes regarding behavioral characteristics. It is quite possible that two teachers may have conflicting views about the same student. This doesn't necessarily indicate that one picture is accurate and one is not. The student may behave quite differently in different situations.

5. Be aware of other errors in observation.

(a) Halo Effect. This is a tendency on the part of observers to be unduly influenced by a single favorable or unfavorable characteristic which colors their judgment of the individual's other traits.

(b) Error of Central Tendency. This is a tendency to place individuals in the middle or average range rather than in extreme positions.

(c) Leniency Error. This error refers to the tendency to assign favorable ratings in most cases and avoid unfavorable ratings.

(d) Age Bias Error. This is a tendency to identify older children in a group as being more capable without considering developmental factors.

Observable Characteristics of Gifted Children

Gifted children exhibit the same variety of characteristics--mental as well as social, emotional, and physical--as any group of children of similar age. Many are friendly and outgoing; some are shy and retiring; most are happy and secure; a few are anxious or depressed; a majority are normal or better than normal physically.

Not all children with high mental ability are readily identified. Parents may not be aware of the literature describing bright children and their needs. Further, because parents are used to their child's level of performance, they often fail to recognize symptoms of high intelligence as unusual in their offspring. Teachers, even though versed in the nature and significance of individual differences, are not always able to apply their knowledge to an understanding of individual pupils. Both knowledge of the qualities which indicate good ability and experience in working with bright children are imperative to adequate identification. Even expert judgment needs to be supplemented by objective evidence. Group tests are useful in screening. ALL EVIDENCE SHOULD BE CONFIRMED BY AN INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION.

Positive Characteristics

As a group, gifted children tend to be strong and healthy, well-adjusted, friendly, understanding, and alert. In a congenial setting, they are likely to:

(1) Learn rapidly and easily
(2) Retain what they learn without much drill
(3) Show much curiosity as indicated by the kinds, depth, scope, and frequency of their questions
(4) Have rich vocabularies marked by originality of thought and expression
(5) Enjoy reading, usually at a mature level
(6) Show interest in words and ideas as demonstrated by their frequent use of dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other resource books
(7) Reason things out, think clearly and precisely, be quick to comprehend
(8) Have the ability to generalize, to see relationships, to make logical associations
(9) Examine, tabulate, classify, collect, and keep records
(10) Know and appreciate many things of which other children are unaware
(11) Be interested in the nature of man and his universe at an early age
(12) Seek older companions among children and enjoy adults
(13) Possess a good sense of humor and be cheerful
(14) Have a strong desire to excel

Negative Characteristics

Characteristics that are negative or unacceptable from an adult's point of view often tend to overshadow more positive signs of ability. Teachers and parents do not welcome all indicators of giftedness.

Gifted children may be:

(1) Restless, inattentive, disturbing, or annoying to those around them, like many children who have unmet needs when they are bored
(2) Poor in spelling, careless in handwriting, or innacurate in arithmetic because they are impatient with details requiring rote learning or drill
(3) Lackadaisal in completing or handing in assignments, and indifferent toward classwork when uninterested, again this usually happens when they are not challenged
(4) Outspokenly critical of themselves and of others, an attitude which often alienates adults as well as children

The foregoing lists provide a few illustrations of characteristics which suggest that a child may be intellectually gifted. Systematic observation and good judgment are very important in identifying children with high mental ability.

Limitations in Identifying Giftedness

Method	Limitations
Teacher observation	May miss underachievers, culturally deprived, motivational problems, emotional problems, and children with belligerent or apathetic attitude toward the school program. Definitely needs supplementing with standardized tests of intelligence and achievement.
Individual intelligence test	The best method, but expensive in use of professional time and services. Not practical as general screening tool in schools with limited psychological services.
Group intelligence test	Generally good for screening. May not identify those with reading difficulties, emotional or motivational problems, or cultural impoverishment.
Achievement test batteries	Will not identify underachieving gifted children. In addition, same limitations as group intelligence test.
Creativity test	New and uncertain validity. Shows promise of identifying good thinkers who may be overlooked on intelligence tests. May be too narrow in scope to be used without supplementing by other measures.

Myths and Facts Pertaining to Giftedness

Myth	Fact
1. Gifted children are weak and unhealthy.	Gifted children actually tend to be stronger, have fewer illnesses and equal or exceed other children in height and weight. Many are outstanding athletes.
2. The gifted child is an oddball.	Teachers often fail to identify gifted children because they seem so normal. Studies show that gifted people are highly stable. Only a small number of them ever spend time in mental institutions.
3. The gifted child is a bookworm, wears eyeglasses, and does not participate in normal children's activities.	Most gifted children are good readers but they engage in many types of activities and have many interests. Some may actually need remedial help in reading.
4. Gifted children are enthusiastic about school and academic work.	Many gifted children are enthusiastic about school, others are bored and are found among dropouts.
5. Gifted children usually are from upper, middle class, professional families.	Gifted children occur in about the same numbers in all socioeconomic groups.
6. All gifted children are social misfits.	Gifted children enjoy social situations, talk readily and know a great deal about many topics. They are often good mixers and assume more than their share of social leadership in school and out.
7. The play interests and activities of gifted children are different from those of normal children.	Although gifted children may prefer more complicated and challenging games, their play interests are usually the same as those of normal age mates.
8. Gifted children are likely to be egotistical and snobbish.	Most gifted children possess desirable personality characteristics.
9. Gifted children with the same IQ's have the same kind of abilities and interests.	Pupils with the same abilities differ widely as each pupil's pattern of abilities and talents is unique. Therefore, differences make it difficult, if not impossible, to put the gifted in homogeneous groups.
10. Gifted children often fail to adjust socially if accelerated in grade placement.	Unless acceleration is excessive, most gifted children make very good social adjustments as they progress through school.

Taken from Guiding the Gifted Child by G. I. Thomas & J. Crescimbeni, Random House, 1966.

Who are the Gifted?

Creative, gifted, and imaginative people are often not recognized by their contemporaries. In fact, many are not identified by school personnel either. History is full of illustrations. Consider the following persons:

Einstein was four years old before he could speak.

Isaac Newton did poorly in elementary school.

Beethoven's music teacher once said of him, "As a composer, he is hopeless."

Thomas Edison was told by his teachers that he was too stupid to do anything.

A newspaper editor fired Walt Disney because he had, "no good ideas."

Caruso's music teacher told him, "You can't sing, you have no voice at all."

Wernher Von Braun flunked 9th grade algebra.

Admiral Richard Byrd had been retired from the Navy, as, "Unfit for Service" until he flew over both poles.

Louis Pasteur was rated as mediocre in chemistry when he attended college.

Abraham Lincoln entered military service as a captain and came out a private.

Louisa M. Alcott was told by an editor that she could never write anything that had popular appeal.

Fred Waring was once rejected from high school chorus.

Winston Churchill failed the sixth grade.

F. W. Woolworth got a job in a dry goods store when he was 21 but his employer would not let him wait on a customer because he, "didn't have enough sense."

These people were probably identified as low achievers in school or as misfits on their jobs because of problems of relevance.

By: Milton E. Larson

Concluding Statement

In this model an effort has been made to provide the user with information which should result in the improvement of observational skills as related to identifying gifted children in an effective manner.

PART I - TEACHER OBSERVATION FORM

G/T SCREENING PROCEDURE

Teacher:_____ Date:_____

School:_____ Grade:_____

Instructions:

This instrument is designed to obtain teacher estimates of a child's characteristics in nine different areas. Each area contains typical behavior characteristics derived from research literature dealing with gifted and creative individuals. It should be noted that a considerable amount of individual differences can be found within this population. Each area should be considered separately and should reflect the degree to which the teacher has observed the presence or absence of the characteristic.

After careful observation of the class for a minimum period of five school days, list a maximum of three children in each area. List the child in each category who best fits most of the descriptive characteristics. Names may be repeated any number of times. If the description does not apply to any individual in the class, draw a horizontal line in the first space. Children should be listed in priority rank in each category.

After completing the nine areas, list the best students in the class (top 10% ONLY) in priority rank using the descriptive characteristics in this instrument.

- -

I. LEARNING CHARACTERISTICS — STUDENTS

Advanced vocabulary for age & grade level; verbal behavior characterized by richness of expression, elaboration, and fluency. Large storehouse of information about a variety of topics. Can make valid generalizations about events, people, or things; looks for similarities and differences in events, people, and things. Reads a great deal on his own; may show preference for biography, autobiography, encyclopedias, and atlases.

1._____
2._____
3._____

II. MOTIVATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS — STUDENTS

Is persistent in seeking task completion; absorbed in certain topics. Needs little external motivation to follow through in work that excites him. Strives toward perfection, self critical. Requires little direction from others.

1._____
2._____
3._____

III. CREATIVITY CHARACTERISTICS

STUDENTS

Generates a large number of ideas or solutions to problems and questions; often offers clever responses. Is uninhibited in expressions of opinion. Displays a good deal of intellectual playfulness; fantasizes; imagines; manipulates ideas. Displays a keen sense of humor.

1._____
2._____
3._____

IV. LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

STUDENTS

Carries responsibility well; can be counted on to do what he has promised and usually does it well. Is self confident with children and adults; seems comfortable when asked to exhibit his work. Well liked by classmates. Generally directs the activity in which he is involved. Excels in athletic activities.

1._____
2._____
3._____

V. ARTISTIC CHARACTERISTICS

STUDENTS

Likes to participate in art activities; eager to visually express ideas. Incorporates a large number of elements into art work. Concentrates for long periods of time on art projects. Tends to select art media for free activity or classroom projects.

1._____
2._____
3._____

VI. MUSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

STUDENTS

Shows a sustained interest in music--seeks out opportunities to hear and create music. Easily remembers melodies and can produce them accurately. Eagerly participates in musical activities. Plays a musical instrument or has a strong desire to do so.

1._____
2._____
3._____

VII. DRAMATICS CHARACTERISTICS

STUDENTS

Volunteers to participate in classroom plays or skits. Easily tells a story or gives an account of some experience. Effectively uses gestures and facial expressions to communicate feelings. Adept at role playing and "on the spot" acting. Able to evoke emotional responses from listeners.

1._____
2._____
3._____

VIII. COMMUNICATION CHARACTERISTICS

STUDENTS

Speaks and writes directly and to the point. Explains things precisely and clearly. Can find various ways of expressing ideas so others will understand. Can describe things in a few appropriate words. Uses voice expressively to convey meaning. Conveys information non-verbally. Interesting storyteller.

1._____
2._____
3._____

IX. PLANNING CHARACTERISTICS

STUDENTS

Determines what information or resources are necessary for accomplishing a task. Grasps the relationship of individual steps involved in a process. Foresees consequences or effects of actions. Organizes work well. Is good at games of strategy.

1._____

2._____

3._____

- -

X. BEST STUDENTS IN THE CLASS

STUDENTS

List the best students in the class ranking in the top 10% as follows:

Class Enrollment:

To 24 - list best 2 students in priority rank
25-34 - list best 3 students in priority rank
35-Up - list best 4 students in priority rank

1._____

2._____

3._____

4._____

- -

Note:

After completion of this instrument, please hold until it is collected.

Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENTATION FOR PEERS

PART II - PEER OBSERVATION FORM

G/T SCREENING PROCEDURE

Description of Technique

This sociometric technique is designed to obtain a pupil's estimate of the behavior characteristics of his/her peers based on observation. The examiner will present to the class a description containing behavior characteristics which are typical of gifted children. The pupils will be asked to list the name of the classmate who best fits the description. A nomination form will be provided for each pupil.

Instructions to Children

Today we are going to play a game called "Guess Who." I am going to describe a person who is a member of this class and I want to see if you can tell me which person I am talking about. When I am finished with each of the five descriptions, write down the first and last name of the person who best fits the description. You may list the name of a classmate one or more times. Consider all of the pupils in this room before making your choice on each description even though some pupils may be absent today. Here are the descriptions.

1. Learning Ability

   Who is the best student in this class? This person may be described as follows: (1) can answer the most questions both on tests and out loud, (2) does a lot of reading and can read books above this grade level, (3) can use big words correctly when speaking and writing, and (4) knows a lot of information about many things. Who is this person?

2. Creative Ability

   Who is the most creative person in this class? This person may be described as follows: (1) very curious - is constantly asking questions about anything and everything, (2) has a lot of ideas to solve problems that come up, (3) has a very good imagination, and (4) has a good sense of humor and can see funny things that most students do not see. Who is this person?

3. Leadership Ability

   Who is the best leader in this class? This person may be described as follows: (1) well liked by students and is the most popular person in the class, (2) can be depended upon to do what was promised and do it well, (3) usually takes charge and directs group activities, and (4) enjoys all sports and games - usually is the best player or star of the game. Who is this person?

4. Performing Arts Ability

Who is the performer in this class? This person may be described as follows: (1) likes to be in school plays and does a good job of performing, (2) is quite interested and takes an active part in musical programs and activities such as singing, dancing, or playing a musical instrument, (3) can tell a story in a very convincing manner so that listeners may laugh, cry, feel scared, etc., and (4) can imitate the speech, walk, and gestures of others. Who is this person?

5. Artistic Ability

Who is the best student in art in this class? This person may be described as follows: (1) likes all kinds of art activities, (2) has good ability to make things out of wood, clay, or metal such as models of all kinds, (3) very good in painting and drawing activities, and (4) spends a lot of time on art projects and does a good job. Who is this person?

Thank you for your help.

PART II - GUESS WHO

MY NAME IS_____

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENTATION FOR PARENTS

PART III - TRAINING MODEL FOR PARENTS

G/T SCREENING PROCEDURE

Introduction

This model contains information that will be helpful to parents in observing and identifying their children who may possess special skills and talents. It is suggested that the users of this model study the material carefully prior to completion of the parent observation form.

Definition of Child with Gifts and Talents

This type of child is one endowed with talent and an innate or potential ability to excel significantly in one or more areas. Such gifts and talents can be evidenced by general intellectual ability, specific aptitude, creative thinking, leadership ability, performing arts ability, or any combination of these.

From an operational standpoint we consider this type of child as one whose abilities, talents, and potential for accomplishment to be outstanding to the point of requiring special provisions to meet his/her educational needs.

Observable Characteristics

High ability children exhibit the same variety of characteristics--mental as well as social, emotional, and physical--as any group of children of similar age. Many are friendly and outgoing; some are shy and reserved; most are happy and secure; a few are anxious or depressed; a majority are normal or better than normal physically.

Not all children with high mental ability are readily identified. Parents may not be aware of the literature describing bright children and their needs. Further, because parents are used to their child's level of performance, they often fail to recognize symptoms of high ability as unusual in their offspring. Teachers, even though versed in the nature and significance of individual differences, are not always able to apply their knowledge to an understanding of individual pupils. Both knowledge of the qualities which indicate good ability and experience in working with bright children are imperative to adequate identification. Even expert judgment needs to be supplemented by objective evidence. Group tests are useful in screening. All evidence should be confirmed by an individual evaluation.

Positive Characteristics

As a group, these children tend to be strong and healthy, well-adjusted, friendly, understanding, and alert. In a congenial setting, they are likely to:

(1) Learn rapidly and easily
(2) Retain what they learn without much drill
(3) Show much curiosity as indicated by the kinds, depth, scope, and frequency of their questions

(4) Have rich vocabularies marked by originality of thought and expression 77
(5) Enjoy reading, usually at a mature level
(6) Show interest in words and ideas as demonstrated by their frequent use of dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other resource books
(7) Reason things out, think clearly and precisely, be quick to comprehend
(8) Have the ability to generalize, to see relationships, to make logical associations
(9) Examine, tabulate, classify, collect, and keep records
(10) Know and appreciate many things of which other children are unaware
(11) Be interested in the nature of man and his universe at an early age
(12) Seek older companions among children and enjoy adults
(13) Possess a good sense of humor and be cheerful
(14) Have a strong desire to excel

Negative Characteristics

Characteristics that are negative or unacceptable from an adult's point of view often tend to overshadow more positive signs of ability. Teachers and parents do not welcome all indicators of brightness.

Children with gifts and talents may be:

(1) Restless, inattentive, disturbing, or annoying to those around them, like many children who have unmet needs when they are bored
(2) Poor in spelling, careless in handwriting, or inaccurate in arithmetic because they are impatient with details requiring rote learning or drill
(3) Lackadaisical in completing or handing in assignments, and indifferent toward classwork when uninterested, again this usually happens when they are not challenged
(4) Outspokenly critical of themselves and of others, an attitude which often alienates adults as well as children

The foregoing lists provide a few illustrations of characteristics which suggest that a child may be bright or talented. Systematic observation and good judgment are very important in identifying children with high mental ability.

Myths and Facts Pertaining to High Ability Children

Myth	Fact
1. High ability children are weak and unhealthy.	These children actually tend to be stronger, have fewer illnesses and equal or exceed other children in height and weight. Many are outstanding athletes.
2. A bright child tends to be an oddball.	Teachers often fail to identify bright children because they seem so normal. Studies show that people with academic skills are fairly stable. Only a small number of them ever spend time in mental institutions.

Myth	Fact
3. A capable child is a bookworm, wears eyeglasses, and does not participate in normal children's activities.	Most capable children are good readers but they engage in many types of activities and have many interests. Some may actually need remedial help in reading.
4. Bright children are enthusiastic about school and academic work.	Many bright children are enthusiastic about school, others are bored and are found among dropouts.
5. High ability children are usually from upper, middle class, professional families.	Children with capabilities occur in about the same numbers in all socioeconomic groups.
6. Children with academic gifts are social misfits.	High ability children enjoy social situations, talk readily and know a great deal about many topics. They are often good mixers and assume more than their share of social leadership in school and out.
7. The play interests and activities of bright children are different from those of normal children.	Although high ability children may prefer more complicated and challenging games, their play interests are usually the same as those of normal age mates.
8. Very capable children are likely to be egotistical and snobbish.	Most of these children possess desirable personality characteristics.
9. All bright children have the same kind of abilities and interests.	Pupils with the same abilities differ widely as each pupil's pattern of abilities and talents is unique. Therefore, differences make it difficult, if not impossible, to put the child with gifts and talents in homogeneous groups.
10. High ability children often fail to adjust socially if accelerated in grade placement.	Unless acceleration is excessive, most high ability children make very good social adjustments as they progress through school.

Concluding Statement

In this model an effort has been made to provide the user with information which should result in the improvement of observational skills as related to identifying children who may possess gifts and talents.

PART III - PARENT OBSERVATION FORM

G/T SCREENING PROCEDURE

Child:_____ Date:_____

Parent:_____ Tel:_____

Address:_____

School:_____ Teacher:_____ Grade:_____

Instructions:

This inventory is designed to obtain parent estimates of their child's behavior which may indicate gifts and talents such as high academic aptitude, creativity, leadership, etc. The rating in each item should reflect the degree to which the parent has observed the presence or absence of the behavior.

Careful observation in as many situations as possible should precede the completion of this form. Place a check mark in the appropriate space in the rating section. If the behavior description does not apply or there is no opportunity to observe a particular behavior, draw a horizontal line in the rating space on the right.

- -

SECTION I - BEHAVIOR CHARACTERISTICS		Low 1	2	Moderate 3	4	High 5
1. Is alert beyond his/her age. Is aware of things others do not see.	1.					
2. Asks a lot of questions about a variety of subjects. Wants to know how and why. Is observant.	2.					
3. Has a wide range of interests. Enjoys school and learning in general.	3.					
4. Sets high standards for himself/herself. Often finds and corrects own mistakes.	4.					
5. Has lots of ideas to share. Makes up stories and ideas that are unique. Likes to pretend.	5.					
6. Ability to plan. Can solve problems in different ways.	6.					
7. Not concerned with details. May become bored with routine activity.	7.					
8. Likes to do many things and participates wholeheartedly. Enjoys other people and seeks them out.	8.					
9. Other children call him/her to initiate activities. Others seem to enjoy his/her company.	9.					
10. Gets other children to do what he/she wants. Is able and willing to work with others.	10.					

SECTION II - TALENTS AND SKILLS

1. List any special skills and/or talents that your child possesses.

_____

_____

_____

Give examples of behavior that illustrates the above.

_____

_____

_____

2. List hobbies and special interests (collections, dancing, making models, swimming, singing, painting, cooking, sewing, drama, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

3. List special lessons, training, or learning opportunities your child is participating in outside of the school program. Any previous activities should be included.

_____

_____

_____

SECTION III - PARENT EVALUATION

On the basis of the information you have received and your observations, do you think that your child might be eligible for participation in a supportive/consultant program for children who possess special skills and talents?

_____YES _____NO _____UNCERTAIN

Comments:_____

_____

SECTION IV - PERMISSION FOR INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION

I grant permission for my child,_____,
to be evaluated individually by the school psychologist. A report of the results will be provided.

_____
(Signature of Parent)

APPENDIX E

TEACHER AND PARENT EVALUATION FORMS

EVALUATION OF G/T SCREENING PROCEDURE

TRAINING MODEL & TEACHER OBSERVATION FORM

Teacher:_____ Date:_____

School:_____ Grade:_____

Please help to improve the screening procedure for the gifted and talented by completing this form. Your thoughtful comments will be most helpful in future revisions. Please hold this form until collected. Thank you.

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
I. TRAINING MODEL			
1. Was the training model presented in a clear and concise manner?	___	___	___
2. Did the material in the model cover the topic satisfactorily?	___	___	___
3. Was the training model of benefit to you			
as a guide in observation?	___	___	___
as basic information?	___	___	___
in other ways?	___	___	___
4. Does any part of the training model need revision? If yes, please elaborate below. Use back of paper if needed.	___	___	___
II. TEACHER OBSERVATION FORM			
1. Was the observation form presented in a clear and concise manner?	___	___	___
2. Did the observation form cover the topic satisfactorily?	___	___	___
3. Was the form of benefit to you as a guide in observation?	___	___	___
4. Does any part of the observation form need revision? If yes, please elaborate below. Use back of paper if needed.	___	___	___

III. COMMENTS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

EVALUATION OF SCREENING PROCEDURE

TRAINING MODEL & PARENT OBSERVATION FORM

Parent:_____

Child:_____ Date:_____

School:_____ Teacher:_____ Grade:_____

Please help to improve the screening procedure for children who possess gifts and talents by completing this form. Your thoughtful comments will be most helpful in future revisions. Thank you.

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
I. TRAINING MODEL			
1. Was the training model presented in a clear and concise manner?	___	___	___
2. Did the material in the model cover the topic satisfactorily?	___	___	___
3. Was the training model of benefit to you			
as basic information?	___	___	___
as a guide in observation?	___	___	___
in other ways?	___	___	___
4. Does any part of the training model need revision? If yes, please elaborate below. Use back of paper if needed.	___	___	___
II. PARENT OBSERVATION FORM			
1. Was the observation form presented in a clear and concise manner?	___	___	___
2. Did the observation form cover the topic satisfactorily?	___	___	___
3. Was the form of benefit to you as a guide in observation?	___	___	___
4. Does any part of the observation form need revision? If yes, please elaborate below. Use back of paper if needed.	___	___	___

III. COMMENTS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX F

SUMMARY OF PUPIL DATA

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF PUPILS WHO MET THE CRITERIA FOR AN INDIVIDUAL EXAMINATION

Name	School	Grade	Teacher Nom.	Peer Nom.	Parent Nom.	Qual. by Gp. Test	Gp. Test Score	Ind. Test Score	Qual. for G/T Prog.
1. S. A.	Peebles	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	136	132	Yes
2. R. B.	Seaman	3	No	No	No	Yes	120	131	Yes
3. T. B.	Tiffin	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	122	126	Yes
4. M. B.	Winchester	4	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	120	130	Yes
5. B. B.	Winchester	5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	121	128	Yes
6. B. B.	Winchester	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	144	137	Yes
7. K. B.	Franklin	5	No	No	Yes	Yes	124	119	No
8. L. B.	Franklin	4	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	138	136	Yes
9. L. C.	Wayne	4	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	125	128	Yes
10. J. C.	Wayne	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	125	126	Yes
11. S. C.	Franklin	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	121	136	Yes
12. B. C.	Franklin	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	125	123	No
13. K. D.	Peebles	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	127	125	Yes
14. J. D.	Wayne	5	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	130	128	Yes
15. S. D.	Winchester	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	129	131	Yes

Name	School	Grade	Teacher Nom.	Peer Nom.	Parent Nom.	Qual. by Gp. Test	Gp. Test Score	Ind. Test Score	Qual. for G/T Prog.
16. C. G.	Winchester	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	125	125	Yes
17. L. G.	Wayne	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	127	133	Yes
18. D. H.	West Union	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	132	133	Yes
19. J. H.	Sink. Spr.	5	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	120	125	Yes
20. F. H.	Wayne	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	127	131	Yes
21. A. J.	West Union	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	128	128	Yes
22. C. K.	Tiffin	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	120	129	Yes
23. D. L.	West Union	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	126	129	Yes
24. P. L.	Franklin	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	125	125	Yes
25. B. M.	West Union	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	126	135	Yes
26. B. M.	West Union	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	127	126	Yes
27. D. M.	Franklin	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	121	122	No
28. J. M.	Peebles	3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	125	119	No
29. S. M.	Franklin	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	135	134	Yes
30. C. M.	Franklin	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	141	132	Yes
31. S. M.	West Union	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	130	132	Yes
32. M. M.	Wayne	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	127	125	Yes

Name	School	Grade	Teacher Nom.	Peer Nom.	Parent Nom.	Qual. by Gp. Test	Gp. Test Score	Ind. Test Score	Qual. for G/T Prog.
33. R. O.	Seaman	3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	125	131	Yes
34. G. P.	Wayne	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	130	125	Yes
35. K. P.	Tiffin	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	120	125	Yes
36. T. R.	Wayne	4	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	125	128	Yes
37. S. S.	West Union	4	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	120	125	Yes
38. T. S.	Peebles	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	134	125	Yes
39. R. S.	Tiffin	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	128	137	Yes
40. L. S.	Wayne	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	135	133	Yes
41. L. T.	Winchester	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	125	134	Yes
42. T. V.	Tiffin	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	144	133	Yes
43. W. W.	Tiffin	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	127	133	Yes
44. S. W.	West Union	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	120	131	Yes
45. K. W.	Tiffin	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	133	130	Yes
46. S. W.	West Union	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	120	127	Yes
47. J. W.	Winchester	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	125	125	Yes

"END OF DOCUMENT"